

Egypt Exploration Society

The Foreign Gifts Offered to Pharaoh

Author(s): Cyril Aldred

Source: *The Journal of Egyptian Archaeology*, Vol. 56 (Aug., 1970), pp. 105-116

Published by: Egypt Exploration Society

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3856046>

Accessed: 11/03/2010 13:14

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://www.jstor.org/action/showPublisher?publisherCode=ees>.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



Egypt Exploration Society is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *The Journal of Egyptian Archaeology*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

THE FOREIGN GIFTS OFFERED TO PHARAOH

By CYRIL ALDRED

IN several of the private tombs of the New Kingdom in ancient Egypt there appears a scene on the rear wall of the first transverse hall and in such a position that the principal figure receives most of the light entering from the tomb entrance.¹ This figure represents almost invariably the Pharaoh shown seated on a throne under an elaborate baldachin and presiding at a state function in which the deceased claimed to have played a cardinal role. The majority of these representations show a parade of tribute offered by foreign emissaries who abase themselves as they are ushered into the royal presence by the deceased. The more elaborate examples appear in duplicate on opposite sides of a doorway leading into the inner part of the tomb-chapel, and it is probable that originally this equipoise was the desideratum which every tomb-owner attempted to obtain; but it was not always secured, either because the tombs were unfinished, or because their architectural vagaries made such a balance impossible to achieve, or because the resources of the owner were not equal to his ambitions. Today, of course, the frequent destruction of the complementary scene has resulted in the survival of only one such painting on the back wall.

These scenes, which first make their appearance in the joint reign of Hatshepsut-Tuthmosis III,² are popular throughout the Eighteenth Dynasty, though towards the end of the period they seem to lose their appeal as a subject for tomb decoration; they virtually vanish from the repertoire in Ramesside times.³ The vast majority of such representations are found in the tombs at Thebes, but examples from El-'Amarna,⁴ Deir Rifa,⁵ and Saqqâra⁶ show that the theme was not confined to the artists who decorated the tomb-chapels of the Southern Residence.

Over ten years ago the writer advanced the suggestion that the scenes of the presentation of tribute, so far from conforming to the generally accepted view that they illustrate the aftermath of a successful campaign with a parade of the spoils of war, in fact represent a public ceremony following on the accession of the Pharaoh, in which the widespread sovereignty of the new ruler was recognized by his acceptance of gifts and homage from foreign delegates as well as from representatives of his own peoples.⁷ Recently D. B. Redford has subjected this thesis to a fairly close study, as a result of which he has concluded that the present writer is mistaken in his interpretation of this genre of scene, and that the procession of tribute-bearers led by the tomb-owner may well represent the plunder from a foreign campaign: on the other hand, it may equally

¹ Wegner, *MDAIK* 4, 53, 55 ff.; Davies, *T. of Ken-Amun*, 17.

³ *Ibid.* 535-6.

² Vandier, *Manuel*, IV, 571-4.

⁵ Petrie, *Gizeh and Rifeh*, pls. xxix-xxx.

⁴ Davies, *Rock Tombs*, II, pl. xxxvii; III, pls. xiii, xiv.

⁷ Aldred, *JEA* 43, 114-17.

⁶ Hari, *Horemheb*, fig. 36.

well depict the arrival of the yearly tribute imposed by the Egyptians on the provinces of their empire.¹ As anyone will be aware who reads my original article without *parti pris*, the last word has hardly been said on this subject, and I welcome the opportunity of dealing at greater length with an idea that I was able to sketch only hurriedly in the form of a brief communication.

As far as the published material is concerned, such scenes showing the tribute of Africa and Asia being offered to the king occur in fourteen of the Theban tombs.² In six of them only the Northern tribute is shown. In the case of Tombs nos. 42, 85, and 239, this is probably because the owners had had predominant interests in Asia as soldiers or officials during their lifetimes. The remaining three tombs (nos. 86, 90, 256) are either damaged or unfinished. The Asian tribute can be identified only generally in five tombs, but in others it is specifically stated to come from Upper and Lower Retenu (nos. 40, 85), Naharin (nos. 84, 90, 91), the Hittite lands (nos. 86, 91), Tunip and Kadesh (no. 86), and Western Asia (no. 100). Included among the Northern tribute-bearers are the Minoan Keftiu (nos. 85, 86), delegates from the Islands in the Mediterranean (no. 100), and the Cilician Menenus (no. 85).³ The Southern tribute is represented in only six tombs. In one (no. 40) it is said to come from Wawat and Kush; in another (no. 84) from Itjer and Miw; in a third (no. 100) from Khenthernūfer and Iunty-Setyu. In the remainder (nos. 78, 89, 91) no precise locality is mentioned but the offering-bearers and their products are typically African. Included in the Southern tribute are commodities from Punt represented in four tombs (nos. 86, 89, 100, 143).

The first conclusion that emerges from a study of these scenes is that the offerings cannot be plunder from the battlefield. The Egyptians, according to all the evidence, led no military expeditions to Punt, to the Islands in the Mediterranean, or to the Hittite lands; yet the tribute from these areas, and its bearers, are intimately associated with those from regions such as Nubia and Kush which were well within the Egyptian imperial grasp. Moreover, the bearers are described as 'chiefs', and no proof has come to light that the rulers of the Keftiu, Hittites, Mitannians, and Puntites were ever taken captive by the Pharaoh. It is true that on occasion the Egyptians did represent the booty gleaned from the field of victory; and the most notable example that springs to mind is the representation in the First Court of the Great Temple at Medinet Habu, where Ramesses III at a Window of Appearances, the Ramesside equivalent of the gilded kiosk of most Eighteenth Dynasty reviews, presides at the triumphal parade after the defeat of the Libyan invaders.⁴ The main features of the spoil are the severed phalli of the Libyan slain and the hands of their slaughtered allies, which are poured in heaps before the king. Samples of the booty comprise captives, horses and chariots, and the long swords of the vanquished.⁵ Tuthmosis III presided at a similar display of spoils after the battle of Megiddo when the hands of the slain were the chief means of estimating the victory.⁶

¹ Redford, *Studies in Chronology*, 120–8.

² A convenient index to such scenes may be found in Porter and Moss, *Top. Bibl.* 1², pt. i, 463, 1(b).

³ Gauthier, *Dict. géogr.* III, 37.

⁵ Nelson, *Or. Inst. Comm.* 10, 21–5.

⁴ E.g. *Medinet Habu*, I, pls. 22, 23, 42; II, pl. 75.

⁶ *Urk.* IV, 659, 15; 663, 7.

Such scenes of carnage and plunder were appropriate for the decoration of the outer walls of a temple where they had their part to play in the exaltation of the conquering Pharaoh as the son of the omnipotent god, and in driving away from the holy precincts any hostile manifestations. But they had little relevance to the decoration of a private tomb-chapel in which the owner was concerned as much with leaving some memorial of his own finest hours on earth as with commemorating the feats of his lord, even though the moment of glory might have been when he took the stage before the Pharaoh on an occasion of great splendour.

The trophies depicted in the presentation scenes in these private tomb-chapels show that the parade is no Roman triumph. The hands of the slain are not exhibited, nor are the suits of inlaid armour which were stripped off the defeated foe in this Homeric age of the chariot-fighter. Tuthmosis III makes a point of describing in his Annals the inlaid bronze armour belonging to the chiefs of Kadesh and Megiddo which was captured in the battles of Year 23, and distinguishes it from other suits belonging to their *maryannu*.¹ A similar distinction is made in the case of the victories at Araina during Year 35 and Tunip in Year 42. Not one single instance has survived of such a notable prize being exhibited among the 'plunder' paraded before the king in these tomb representations.² In some tombs, such as nos. 42, 86, and elsewhere, plumed casques are offered by Syrian bearers,³ but these are clearly presentation-pieces and not the spoils of the battlefield.

In the procession of Northerners represented in Tomb no. 86 the chiefs of the Kheta, Tunip, and Kadesh are explicitly named. The Annals at Karnak state that tribute from the Kheta was received in Years 33 and 41,⁴ and spoils (¶ 4) from the capture of Tunip and Kadesh in Year 42.⁵ This scene, therefore, if it has any basis in historical reality, can hardly refer to the campaigns of Year 33, as Redford supposes on the strength of the accompanying inscriptions, which vaguely boast of the harrowing of Mitanni.⁶ The best that can be said is that the tribute of Year 41 and the plunder of Year 42 have been shown presented at the same time, even though the trophies do not include the hands of the slain, or the reaped grain, or the other spoils exacted from a defeated Tunip and Kadesh in Year 42. Redford claims that such tribute cannot have been offered on the occasion of a coronation because there is a complete lack of reference to that event in word or artistic motive,⁷ a criticism which we shall examine in due course. But it is also the case that there is no indication that the 'plunder' is received as a result of victory in the field, as we have already argued in the case of the tribute presented by the Hittites, Minoans, and Puntites. Redford, however, quotes texts from tombs which he thinks demonstrate that victorious campaigns preceded the show of tribute.

The first example is from Tomb no. 86 where Tuthmosis III is hailed in such terms as 'fear of thee is in all lands. Thou hast destroyed the lands of Mitanni. Thou hast laid waste their towns. Their chiefs are (hiding) in holes.'⁸ There is nothing

¹ *Ibid.* 664, 3-5.

² The corselets shown in the tomb of Kenamün are 'New Year's' gifts, not booty; Davies, *T. of Ken-Amun*, pls. xvi, xxiv. ³ *Id.*, *T. of Menkheperrasonb*, 8, No. 63. ⁴ *Urk.* IV, 701, 11-14; 727, 12-13.

⁵ *Urk.* IV, 729, 15-18; 730, 8-12.

⁶ Redford, *op. cit.* 126.

⁷ *Ibid.* 123.

⁸ Davies, *T. of Menkheperrasonb*, pl. vii.

explicit in this, which merely repeats the boast of Tuthmosis III that he laid waste Naharin in Year 33 and again in Year 35, a claim that is regarded with some scepticism by many modern scholars.¹ Davies in his publication of the scene attempts to draw a distinction between tribute freely offered by the Minoan contingent, and that exacted from the 'subdued enemies' in the lower registers; but he admits the weakness of his case in as much as delegates from the Oases are included in the latter group.² It may be as well to mention here an even more striking anomaly in the damaged tribute scenes from Tomb no. 78 where the first register consists of Egyptians bringing horses; the second, of native Egyptians including the king's stewards carrying gifts; and the remaining two registers, of Syrians, Nubians, and Kushites with their tribute.³

Another of Redford's examples comes from the tomb of Rekhmire⁴ (no. 100) where the vizier speaks of 'receiving all the tribute of all lands brought to Tuthmosis III because of his might'.⁴ This phrase is repeated in each register, referring to contributions from Punt, the Keftiu lands, and the Islands in the Mediterranean, as well as from Nubia, Retenu, and Western Asia. The lowest register in this scene, while related by position to the main composition, is somewhat different since it refers not to 'tribute' offered to the king, but to that portion of the 'booty' captured by him and allocated to the offices of the temple of Amun over which Rekhmire⁴ presided. This plunder differs markedly from the tribute in consisting not of precious objects, but solely of slaves and captives from Africa as well as Asia. Here a clear distinction has been made between tribute (𓁴) and spoils (𓁵) falling to the temple of Amun.⁵ We shall have more to say about this particular scene later.

A third example of what Redford regards as a presentation to the king of similar plunder occurs on the Zizinia fragment alleged to come from Horemheb's destroyed tomb at Saqqara. Redford thinks this provides proof that what the Pharaoh was receiving, as he and his queen stood at their Window of Appearances, was booty from a successful campaign which Horemheb as heir-apparent had just waged in the South.⁶ Robert Hari, however, in his careful study of this re-discovered fragment, has given good grounds for believing that it does not come from the tomb but belongs to Horemheb's earliest years in office.⁷ Furthermore, Hari casts grave doubts upon whether the mission from which Horemheb had returned was a campaign at all, and inclines to the view that it was a diplomatic errand. The present writer suggests that it is most likely to have been an expedition of a similar sort to that made by another king's messenger (*wpwty nsw*), Neferher, in Year 1 of Siptah when he secured the loyalty of the local governors of Nubia for another boy-king who had just ascended the throne.⁸

¹ E.g. Gardiner, *Egypt of the Pharaohs*, 230.

² Davies, op. cit. 4.

³ Bouriant, *Mem. Miss.* v, 2, pl. iv; *Urk.* iv, 1592.

⁴ Davies, *T. of Rekh-mi-rē*, figs. 1, 2.

⁵ It should be noted that though the African slaves are lumped with the Asiatics in this scene, they cannot have been captured by large-scale campaigns similar to those waged in Asia.

⁶ Redford, op. cit. 126.

⁷ Hari, op. cit. 64 ff. The pose of Horemheb, leaning upon a cane, surely indicates that he cannot be in the royal presence. Moreover, it is highly improbable that victory over a foreign foe would have been credited to a private person in any official utterance at this time.

⁸ Maspero in Davis, *T. of Siptah*, p. xxi.

The last example occurs in Tomb no. 42 where Redford interprets a damaged painting on the *end wall* of the transverse chamber as depicting 'the capture of a Syrian town by Egyptian troops', who 'lead off captives, among whom is a "chief of Lebanon"'.¹ Those who expect from this description to see a spirited scene showing the storming of a fortress must prepare themselves for a shock. The 'town' sits peacefully among a grove of unfelled trees, its ramparts unmanned and with not a scaling-ladder or foeman in sight. It is identified by Davies as the fortified residence of a chief.² So far from being a scene of warfare and conquest it surely shows the reception of the *hry pdt* Amenmose by the local chief of Negau who comes from his palace to welcome the Egyptian contingent with characteristic Oriental courtesy, bringing a gift of wine, a tray of bread, two bulls, a large decorated vessel (of water?), and a towel. We have here a scene of the billeting of an Egyptian task-force on the local inhabitants such as is referred to in the 'Amarna Letters',³ and the import of which has been missed by both Davies and Redford. It concerns the exploits of Amenmose in the life he lived on earth as a soldier and administrator, and has no relevance either in subject-matter or position to the adjacent scene on the back wall where Tuthmosis III or Amenophis II receives tribute from the Northern peoples.⁴

If such scenes show no signs of being a parade of the spoils of war, we have still to consider whether they might not be the presentation of annual tribute 'imposed by the Egyptians on the provinces of their empire', which is Redford's alternative suggestion. For this, the evidence at a first glance might seem to be conclusive. The Annals of Tuthmosis III speak of receiving the products (𓁵 𢓃 𢓃) of Nubia, or Kush, or of both, in Years 31, 33, 34, 35, 38, 40, 41, and 42. From this record, bearing in mind its incomplete state, it looks as though the tribute from Nubia and Kush was an annual event, particularly as it speaks of receiving their harvest-taxes (𢓃 𢓃). It certainly cannot be plunder taken as a result of field warfare, since both Nubia and Kush were relatively peaceful in the reign of Tuthmosis III, and, apart from his hunting expedition in Year 50,⁵ there is no record of any campaign that he fought in the region. The usual grandiloquent boast on the Sixth Pylon at Karnak that he had overthrown the Nubians, making a great slaughter among them, and removing captives to Thebes,⁶ need not refer to anything more than police action on the unsettled desert frontiers.

The products received from these African dependencies do not vary from year to year and consist of slaves, cattle, gold, and ships laden with the raw produce of the area, including ivory, ebony, and pelts. A yearly interval for these dues is explicitly referred to in a model letter in Papyrus Koller III, appositely quoted by Gardiner,⁷ which details the kind of tribute that a garrison commander was expected to collect in Nubia during Ramesside times, and exhorts him with the injunction, 'increase thy contributions every year'.

Tuthmosis III, also, in an inscription in Room XIII of his Festival Hall at Karnak,⁸

¹ Redford, op. cit. 125.

² Davies, *T. of Menkheperrasonb*, 30, pl. xxxvi.

³ Mercer, *Tablets*, no. 222a.

⁴ Davies, op. cit., pls. xxxiii–xxxv.

⁵ Arkell, *Hist. Sudan*, 88–9.

⁶ *Urk.* IV, 795, 7–12.

Davies and Gardiner, *T. of Huy*, 28; Caminos, *L. Eg. Misc.* 437–9.

⁸ *Urk.* IV, 871.

dedicates to Amon-Rē certain treasure which comes to him from the Southern countries 'as their yearly dues'. In the New Kingdom the Egyptians governed Nubia and Kush through an administration modelled on that of Egypt proper, and it is clear that taxes were exacted from the various districts in the same way as they were levied upon the towns and regions of Egypt herself.¹ It should be noted, however, that in the tomb-pictures of the Southern tribute, while natural products are usually shown, including such exotic animals as cheetahs, giraffes, apes, and ostriches, as well as the staple ebony, ivory, and gold, the grain harvest is never represented though it was collected annually.² In one scene in Tomb no. 40, which is unique in its elaboration and detail, industrial products of Nubia and Kush are displayed in addition to raw materials. The significance of this will be examined later.

The produce of Punt, which is included in the tribute from the Southern dependencies, at least cannot have been acquired by annual taxation, but must have been obtained by barter, as is evident from the pictures of the trade-goods offered by the Egyptians to the rulers of Punt in the reign of Hatshepsut.³ It is doubtful whether a trading mission was dispatched to Punt every year or even every reign.

The tribute shown in the hands of Asiatics is also unlikely to have been an annual levy. In the first place, the Egyptians had no means of taxing the Hittites, Minoans, Mitannians, and other remote and independent nations of the Near East. Secondly, the tribute shown is not in the form of raw materials, such as the Nubians and Kushites supplied, but in finished work of great elegance and opulence. It is possible that the Egyptians were able to impose taxes upon some of the vassal states of Palestine and Syria that were well within their power; and certain towns which appear to have been dedicated to Egyptian gods or members of the Royal House may have paid an annual levy. It also seems to have been the case, particularly during the reign of Tuthmosis III, when extensive field operations were mounted against Asiatic forces, and towns in Syria and Palestine were sacked, that such raw materials as timber and grain were seized and distributed among the Egyptian temples, especially those of Amūn. But the general impression left by the tomb-scenes of Asian tribute is that these are not displays of the annual exactions.

If they are, then there is an Asian commodity which is conspicuously absent. The only thing notably lacking in the Egyptian economy was good constructional timber which could be supplied only from Asian sources, and which had been in constant demand from earliest times. Baulks of ebony are always shown among the raw materials presented by Nubia and Kush; but apart from a scene in Tomb no. 100,⁴ which has some claim to be considered exceptional (see below), no timber in log or plank form is represented among the tribute of Asia. In the time of Wenamūn, supplies of wood could be procured from the Lebanon only by paying for them with gold and silver; and the Prince of Byblos produced records to show that such payment had been made by Egyptian kings during past transactions.⁵ Even in the halcyon days of Tuthmosis III,

¹ Säve-Söderbergh, *Ägypten u. Nubien*, 186 ff.

² Ibid. 225-6.

³ Naville, *Deir el-Bahari*, III, pl. lxix.

⁴ Davies, *T. of Rekh-mi-rē*, pl. xxi.

⁵ Gardiner, *L.-Eg. Stories*, 68, 1-6.

the Chancellor Sennufri, who went to the Lebanon to obtain timber for his king, paid for it with generous offerings to Hathor of Byblos.¹

Two decades ago, Gardiner pointed out that the word 'tribute' would be better rendered by 'gifts';² but as far as the Asiatics were concerned, they were gifts that had to be paid for by presents of equivalent worth. The 'Amarna Letters reveal that every dispatch from the royal correspondents was accompanied by a gift, except in one certain case concerning the King of Babylon.³ The value of such gifts is precisely stated, probably because the donors expected a return of equal value. Burnaburiash, for instance, is quite explicit that since Pharaoh has not sent him anything valuable by the hand of his envoy, he in turn has nothing precious to send Pharaoh.⁴ The few drafts of dispatches from Amenophis III and Akhenaten reveal that they too sent rich gifts to their brother monarchs, gifts that hostile propaganda could well have represented as 'tribute' paid by the subservient Egyptians.⁵

It was not only the rulers of the great powers who engaged in such traffic; the vassal prince Milkilu of Gezer received presents from Amenophis III.⁶ The vassals could also apparently withhold their 'tribute'. Rib-Adda, so far from sending grain, asked Pharaoh for it.⁷ When Sum-Adda received the request to furnish grain, he refused it on the score that it was spoiled, and protested that such demands had not been made for years.⁸ Rib-Adda also excused himself from supplying boxwood with the complaint that Aziru commanded the trade routes;⁹ and Pharaoh had to make application to Aziru instead.¹⁰ Rib-Adda further complained that while other princes had been sent supplies by Pharaoh, he had not been so favoured, though his father in his time had been given silver.¹¹ The withholding of such a valuable gift diminished his standing in the eyes of other princes, and he renewed his appeal for it.¹² In exchange for a quantity of precious stone, Abi-milki of Tyre asked Pharaoh for the town of Uzu.¹³ Milkilu requested Pharaoh to send him myrrh for medicine.¹⁴ If it be argued that the 'Amarna Letters reflect a situation in which Egyptian power in Asia was on the wane, and the Pharaoh could no longer make extortionate demands upon his vassals, it can be pointed out that the casual gifts of lapis lazuli sent by Burnaburiash to Akhenaten do not compare unfavourably with the 'tribute' sent from Ashur which Tuthmosis III was so concerned to mention in his Annals of Year 23.¹⁵

From this testimony it should be evident that Asian tribute is no more than disguised state-trading, represented by the Pharaohs as a one-sided commerce. Modern scholars show signs of discarding the idea that the Egyptians excercised a sort of Roman imperium in Asia. It is doubtful whether even the bellicose Tuthmosis III had to engage in any large-scale actions after his victory over the Asiatic confederation at Megiddo in his regnal year 23; and it would rather appear that his subsequent campaigns were little more than interventions in the local politics of Syria and

¹ *Urk.* iv, 531-6; Wilson in *ANET*, 243.

² Gardiner, *Onom.* I, 177*.

³ Knudtzon, *Tafeln*, No. 4.

⁴ *Ibid.*, no. 10, ll. 12-17.

⁵ *Ibid.*, nos. 5, 14, 31.

⁶ Dossin, *Rev. d'Assyr.* 31, 125-36.

⁷ Knudtzon op. cit., nos. 79, 85, 131.

⁸ *Ibid.*, no. 224.

⁹ *Ibid.*, no. 126, ll. 4-13.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, no. 160, ll. 14-19.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, no. 126, ll. 15-21.

¹² *Ibid.*, no. 137, ll. 12-14.

¹³ *Ibid.*, no. 148, ll. 6-13.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, no. 269.

¹⁵ *Urk.* iv, 668, 5-15; Knudtzon, op. cit., no. 10, ll. 40-3.

Palestine on behalf of loyal vassals, tasks that in the 'Amarna Age, and probably in the two preceding reigns, had been largely undertaken by Egyptian commissioners with the aid of garrison troops reinforced with local levies.

While such tribute was more in the nature of gifts, as its quality and character suggest, often accompanying diplomatic missions that sometimes took a considerable time to reach Egypt, its infrequent appearance might perhaps make it an annual event. But it is clear that all such random tribute could hardly have arrived at the same moment from Africa as well as Asia. If it shows no signs of being either plunder from a foreign campaign, or the yearly tribute imposed by the Egyptians on the provinces of their 'empire', as Redford avers, what then is it? Are we to interpret the scenes in which Pharaoh presides at a show of presents from various nations as representing an ideal occasion, symbolizing his claims to rule over all that the sun encircled, and to receive from its grateful inhabitants their tribute loyally offered every year? Or do they in fact commemorate a historical event? In order to answer these questions we shall first have to consider the presentation of tribute in relation to the scene which often forms its pendant.

Such scenes of royal ceremony, depicted on either side of the doorway that pierces the rear wall of the transverse hall, are related to each other by position, and in certain examples they can be shown to refer to events that are closely connected by time. Thus the present writer has already argued that an equipoise of such scenes in Tombs nos. 48 and 57 refers to occasions in the First Jubilee of Amenophis III, when the tomb-owners came before their king in audience.¹ A similar balance is seen in the tomb of K̄enamūn where a parade of 'New Year's' gifts is shown in one scene as a pendant to the appointment of K̄enamūn to office by Amenophis II in the other. The latter event must have followed very soon after the accession of the Pharaoh since K̄enamūn is already in office at the presentation of the 'New Year's' gifts, which the writer has sought to show was actually the display of the 'trousseau' of the young king supplied for his coronation.²

A common pendant scene is the presentation of a bouquet to the king seated upon his throne within the kiosk (e.g. in Tombs nos. 72, 74, 75, 78, 85, 86, 90, 91, 110). Such homage, accompanied by formal wishes for the health and prosperity of the Pharaoh, is unlikely to have been paid daily, and the scene must commemorate a special occasion of great significance. This appears in fact to have been the first state appearance of the new king, or his reappearance after the jubilee rites. Thus Rekh-mirē travelling from Thebes to be officially received for the first time by Amenophis II at Hū, did so in order to present a bouquet (of Amūn) to him.³ The First Prophet Rē offers a bouquet of Amūn to the same king, whose youth is emphasized by the presence of his mother Queen Merytrē in the kiosk with him.⁴ The Second Prophet of Amūn, Amenhotpe-sise, presented a bouquet of Amūn to Tuthmosis IV on the occasion of marshalling before him the 'trousseau' for his coronation.⁵ Surero proffers bouquets to Amenophis III, seated in state and wearing his chequered cloak, on the

¹ Aldred, *JEA* 55, 76.

⁴ Lepsius, *Denk.* 111, 62b.

² *Ibid.* 79.

³ Davies, *op. cit.* 63-4.
Davies, *T. of Two Officials*, pls. xi, xii; Aldred, *op. cit.* 80.

occasion of one of his jubilees.¹ The scene in Tomb no. 55 where the vizier Ramose offers a bouquet of Rē-Herakhty to Amenophis IV also, most probably, refers to the first state appearance of the young king since his figure is carved in the orthodox style of his father's reign and he is enthroned in the kiosk with Ma'et rather than with his queen who, however, accompanies him in the pendent scene.²

The offering of bouquets occasionally alternates with the presentation of standards as in Tombs nos. 48, 55, and 188.³ Such standards are usually of the gods, chiefly Amūn, though Mut, Khons, and Rē-Herakhty also appear. An example where a military standard is presented occurs in the tomb of the *hry pdt* Nebamūn (no. 90).⁴ This suggests that all such religious emblems and repositories of numinous power had to be consecrated by the monarch at his accession, since specimens bearing the new name of the king, or his image, were prepared as part of the royal 'trousseau', like the royal statues destined for installation in every appropriate shrine.⁵

The evidence seems to the present writer voluminous enough to suggest that the idea which these pictures intended to convey was the functioning of the tomb-owner in his official capacity before the king 'who had made him' at the moment of that monarch's first ceremonial appearance when he received the homage of all his subjects. The fact that such scenes are not dated⁶ is paradoxically in favour of this interpretation, just as the so-called 'Marriage' Scarab of Amenophis III, which is presumably the official rescript of the king's accession,⁷ is the only one in the series not to bear a date.

It is true that Redford claims to have found one such scene in the tomb of Nebamūn (no. 90) dated to Year 6 of Tuthmosis IV,⁸ but this is a misunderstanding based upon his disregard of Egyptian principles of picture-making. In the reliefs and paintings in the Theban tombs of the Eighteenth Dynasty, each wall is almost invariably⁹ considered as an independent hoarding for the display of icons which often have no connection with their neighbours apart from proximity. The scenes are separated from each other by horizontal lines but vertical divisions are usually lacking, except when they take the form of such devices as columns of inscriptions. Nevertheless, the different subjects are carefully segregated by the organization of the picture-space so that they can be isolated by drawing rectangular frames around them in much the same manner as they were originally laid out by the draughtsman. Such separate elements in the wall-decoration follow well-known principles of Egyptian composition, the chief feature of which is that the space is so managed that the focal point is directed to the centre of the scene. The principal figures confront one another; and where two

¹ Säve-Söderbergh, *Private Tombs at Thebes*, I, pl. xl; Aldred, op. cit. 76.

² Davies, *T. of Ramose*, pls. xxix, xxx, xxxiii.

³ Davies, *ibid.*, pl. xxxi; *JEA* 9, 136; Säve-Söderbergh, op. cit., pl. xl.

⁴ Davies, *T. of Two Officials*, pl. xxvi.

⁵ Aldred, op. cit. 80; Nelson, *Or. Inst. Comm.* 18, 48-51.

⁶ The exception to this, the dated scenes in the 'Amarna versions, is dealt with below.

⁷ Maspero in Davis, *T. of Queen Tiyi*, p. xviii.

⁸ Redford, op. cit. 127.

⁹ The only exception known to me occurs in Tomb no. 56, where the king's retinue are crammed awkwardly into the margin of the west wall of the hall because there was not room for them in the adjacent scene on the south wall.

main figures are placed back to back an invisible vertical division must be assumed between them forming the boundary of two different scenes.

Thus in the case of the painting which appears on the south side of the west wall of Nebamūn's tomb-chapel,¹ Redford has telescoped into one event two entirely unrelated scenes, the first referring to the consecration of the standard of the royal bark at the advent of Tuthmosis IV; and the other, the appointment of Nebamūn to a new post, that of Chief of Police on the west of Thebes in Year 6 of the same king. For the latter ceremony Nebamūn appears with a different standard and in a more informal costume before the king's scribe Yuny who deputizes for the king at this function. The fact that Yuny's back is turned to the Pharaoh only emphasizes that a different scene is in question here, a distinction which is evident even in the appearance of the accompanying texts. A similar dichotomy is seen in the paintings on the north side of the same wall where the main scene, in which Nebamūn in gala dress and holding his boat-standard and bouquet as he presents the tribute of Syria to the king, is immediately followed by a completely different scene of vintners and butchers who turn their backs upon the king and tribute-bearers. The precise dating of the appointment of Nebamūn as Chief of Police only emphasizes the fact that the consecration of the standard and the presentation of the northern tribute to the king are not dated because the Egyptian assumed that the spectator would clearly understand when such notable events had occurred.

The scenes in the tomb of Rekhmirē^c (no. 100) have to be interpreted according to the same ideas of picture-making. Only one representation of the king within his kiosk appears in the transverse hall and that is on the south side of the rear wall. This scene shows Tuthmosis III appointing Rekhmirē^c to office probably on the occasion of his Second Jubilee.² The vizier appears before the king who addresses to him the traditional homily on his duties inscribed in twenty-one columns of text which separate the investiture from the adjacent scene of the reception of tribute. This latter event is shown taking place before the vizier, not the king, in conformity with the practice in the earlier part of the dynasty when a disinclination to portray the Pharaoh in private tombs is evident.² The text declares that the tribute is being received by Rekhmirē^c, and the design emphasizes the fact, with the vizier standing in advance of the other high officials. What is evidently represented here are those gifts offered to the king, apparently at his Second Jubilee, and that part of the human plunder from the king's wars which were both destined for the temple of Amūn at Karnak, and which Rekhmirē^c receives in his capacity as Steward of Amūn, as well as Mayor of Thebes.

It is the tomb of Huy (no. 40), however, which has provided the classic example of the equipoise of foreign tribute.³ The envoys and their gifts are introduced to Tutankhamūn by Huy as Viceroy of Kush, in respect of the African delegates, and as King's Envoy to Every Land, in so far as the Asian representatives are concerned. The African gifts are shown in exceptional detail probably because Huy was more intimately concerned with marshalling them for the grand ceremony of presentation. In addition to

¹ Davies, *op. cit.*, pl. xxvi.

² Davies, *T. of Rekh-mi-rē^c*, 15.

³ Davies and Gardiner, *T. of Huy*, pls. xix–xxx.

the usual raw materials, finished goods of great elegance appear, including ebony furniture and parade-shields very similar in design to actual specimens found in the tomb of Tutankhamūn.¹ The presence of a pair of thrones, one with lion-head bosses,² indicates that this array of treasure is part of the 'trousseau' of the newly risen king, and not the annual impost.³ Among the chiefs of Wawat in native dress shown making their obeisance before the enthroned king is the Governor of Mī'ām, Heknūfer, whose tomb at Toshka reveals him to have been 'a child of the royal nursery' and a loyal and educated state official, not a rebellious savage.⁴ It is quite clear from this painting that if the African tribute is not a parade of the annual taxes exacted from the region, neither is it loot from the field of battle, despite the presence of manacled slaves at the tail-end of the procession, who are doubtless offered as part of the native produce.

The Asiatic tribute which Huy also claims to have presented to his king is described as from 'all the chiefs of foreign lands who are in embassy with Pharaoh',⁵ and unless it is maintained that Tutankhamūn was able to exert a control abroad which even Tuthmosis III had not been able to exercise, these gifts cannot be either taxes or plunder. If some of the delegates grovel in the presence of the king, their obeisance has as much significance as the prostration of Heknūfer in the companion scene.

The presence of Heknūfer and the Nubian princess with her separate retinue⁶ in this procession shows that Huy is representing no ideal parade of tribute but a historical event, since it is exceedingly improbable that such important native functionaries would have appeared every year with the annual impost. Similarly in Tomb no. 86, the arbitrary nature of the selection suggests that the chiefs of the Keftiu, Kheta, Tunip, and Kadesh represent an actual delegation. Surely the purpose for which such embassies were sent from the contiguous nations of Egypt can only have been to attend notable occasions in the lives of the Pharaohs, such as their accessions or jubilees, when vows of loyalty or friendship accompanying rich gifts would have been made? It is clear that such envoys were dispatched on the death of a king,⁷ and it requires no leap to conclusions to affirm that similar delegations, if not the same embassies, would be sent to attend the installation of his successor.

That this is the case is suggested by a text in Tomb no. 84 accompanying the Nubian contingent who are described as 'entering in before thy Majesty (Tuthmosis III) bearing their gifts of the beginning of the year' (𓀃𓀃).⁸ *Tpy rnpt* in this context presumably has the basic meaning that Parker assigns to it, and refers to the first day of the original lunar year.⁹ This was doubtless a moment of critical importance in the life of the Pharaoh and referred, if not to the day of his accession in the Eighteenth Dynasty, then to his coronation following the rising of Sothis.¹⁰

The same phrase is used in respect of the Northern tribute in Tomb no. 86 where the owner offers a bouquet of Amūn to Tuthmosis III at the Festival of Djeserakhet

¹ *Ibid.* pl. xxv; Carter, *T. of Tut·ankh·amen III*, 142.

² The two specimens shown in Lepsius, *Denk.* III, 117, are doubtless the result of incorrect restoration.

³ Aldred, *op. cit.* 80.

⁴ Simpson, *Expedition* 4, no. 2, 29-36.

⁵ Davies and Gardiner, *op. cit.* 30.

⁶ *Ibid.*, pl. xxviii.

⁷ Knudtzon, *op. cit.*, no. 27, ll. 100-1; no. 29, ll. 91; no. 30.

⁸ *Urk.* IV, 950, 10.

⁹ Parker, *Calendars*, § 306.

¹⁰ *Ibid.* §§ 315, 302-3; *id. Rev. d'Ég.* 11, 92-3.

'on his journeyings of the beginning of the year' (𓀃 𓀃 𓀃 𓀃 𓀃 𓀃).¹ Despite its place of celebration, the festival in question can hardly have been the Feast of the Valley which was held in the second month of *Shōmu*;² and it is most likely to have been another name for the Feast of *Nhb-kw* held on the first day of *Prōyet*, considered as a New Year's festival and 'a coronation feast . . . at which Horus assumes the rule in the place of his dead father. For this reason, this day too can be considered as a royal feast for the living Horus.'³ It was celebrated by the bringing of bouquets, among other rites.

The phrase *tpy rnpt* in both these texts is doubtless qualitative rather than strictly temporal in meaning. It is exceedingly improbable that such lavish gifts were bestowed upon the king every year from foreign delegates as we have already argued. Comparable ceremonies concerned with the appointment of his officials or the consecration of his 'trousseau' must have followed soon after the formal coronation of the Pharaoh;⁴ but the presentation of gifts by foreign envoys must have been made only when the Pharaoh had been recognized as the new ruler of Egypt by those nations who were in diplomatic correspondence with him. The two events could occasionally have been synchronous, as almost certainly was the case when, for example, Amenophis III, Tutankhamūn, and Ay ascended the throne; and as also must have occurred when the king repeated the various ceremonies of installation at his jubilee. But during the Eighteenth Dynasty it is also probable that in some instances where co-regents were appointed, the foreign tribute was not received until the king had acceded to sole rule. In several cases this may have been some years after his coronation, though those scholars who maintain that all co-regencies during the Eighteenth Dynasty were of short duration are likely to take the view that only a few months of preparation could have separated the two events.

The magnates who had the tribute scenes depicted in their tombs did not date them since they were concerned only with showing their kings in all their eternal and divine glory rather than as actors in a changing historical scene. Nevertheless at El-'Amarna the two versions of the tribute-scene differ from all their congeners elsewhere in bearing a precise date. This is probably because the event is represented as an incident in the life of the king, not of the tomb-owner, in conformity with that arrogation by the Royal Family at El-'Amarna of all the subjects that earlier had been reserved to the deceased.⁵

¹ Davies, *T. of Menkheperrasonb*, pl. iii.

² Schott, *Or. Inst. Comm.* 18, 73.

³ Ibid. 79. It should be noted, however, that Parker (op. cit. §§ 331–5) regards the equation of *tpy rnpt* with the day of the celebration of *nhb-kw* as not proved.

⁴ Aldred, op. cit. 81.

⁵ Davies, *Rock Tombs* 1, 19. It may also be that the event is dated at El-'Amarna because it was held on a day different from that on which the function was traditionally celebrated.